

STERCORARIUS PARASITICUS. *Buffon's Skua.*

This species was very plentiful during the time of our visit, and we were enabled to examine a large series of its eggs. The usual breeding-places are in the higher fell-morasses, though occasionally it nests close to the river—never, of course, in the fir-region. The principal food seems to be decayed lemmings; it appears to prefer them in this state, as we found "larders" of lemmings in various stages of decomposition round the nests, and the birds when skinned gave out a most offensive smell. They betray their nests by flying round and hovering like Kestrels while uttering their chough-like cry "*jeou-jeou.*" The Finnish name is "*Kihu.*" Occasionally the eggs are of a beautiful sky-blue ground-colour without spots.

LARUS ARGENTATUS. *Herring-Gull.*

We saw a few on migration in May.

LARUS GLAUCUS. *Glaucous Gull.*

We saw one on migration in May.

COLYMBUS SEPTENTRIONALIS. *Red-throated Diver.*

Fairly common, especially on the higher lakes towards the frontier of Norway.

COLYMBUS ARCTICUS. *Black-throated Diver.*

Fairly common.

IV.—*Remarks on Schaeffer's 'Museum Ornithologicum'**.

By P. L. SCLATER, D.Sc., F.R.S.

IN the last number of this Journal ('Ibis,' 1904, p. 550) Dr. Hartert stated his opinion that the generic terms proposed by Schaeffer in his 'Museum Ornithologicum,' published in 1789, "are not admissible," because the author "did not use binomial nomenclature." I do not quite agree with Dr. Hartert on this subject, and I trust that he will excuse me if I explain my reasons for taking a different view.

* 'Museum Ornithologicum, exhibens enumerationem et descriptionem Avium, quas novâ prorsus ratione sibi paratas in Museo suo asservat Diacobus Christianus Schaeffer.' Ratisbonæ, 1789.

Diacobus Christianus Schaeffer, whose writings seem to have been mostly on entomology, published two ornithological works—the ‘Elementa Ornithologica’ in 1774, and the ‘Museum Ornithologicum’ in 1789. In the first of these Schaeffer used no specific terms, and his genera, therefore, cannot be accepted. But the second work, published in 1789, twenty-three years after the issue of the twelfth edition of the ‘Systema Naturæ,’ cannot be so easily disposed of. Schaeffer’s ‘Museum Ornithologicum’ consists of an enumeration and description of the specimens of birds in his own Museum, “prepared in a new way.” Two hundred and twenty-nine specimens are catalogued, and referred to fifty-nine genera. At the head of each species stands the name in three languages—Latin, German, and French. Thus No. 3 of Schaeffer’s ‘List’ is designated

“COLUMBA PALUMBUS. LE PIGEON RAMIER. RINGELTAUBE,”

after which follows a short Latin diagnosis and references to previous authorities—usually Brisson, Linnæus (‘Systema Naturæ,’ 12th edition), and Buffon, besides others. The whole of the two hundred and twenty-nine *Latin* names of Schaeffer in the work are binomial, with the following five exceptions :—

No.	Name.	Page
26.	<i>Accipiter Circus major</i>	8
83.	<i>Passer Passerculus Bononiensis</i>	25
84.	<i>Passer Linaria vulgaris</i>	26
108.	<i>Alauda cristata minor</i>	32
251.	<i>Psittacus amazonicus fronte luteo</i>	45

Now it seems to me to be rather hard to refuse to recognise the generic names established in the present work because, out of some two hundred and twenty specific names, five are not strictly binomial. Trinomials, we know, are much in vogue at the present time, and I have heard that the idea of such names as quadrimomials is entertained, so we should not be too severe on Schaeffer’s slight lapses from orthodoxy.

Let us now consider Schaeffer’s fifty-nine generic names used in the present work, which are mostly those propounded

in his former work, the 'Elementa Ornithologica,' though some are additional. Of these fifty-nine generic names, thirty-three are the same as those employed by Linnæus in the twelfth edition of his 'Systema Naturæ' (1766), which is always quoted by Schaeffer; but twenty-six are new and adopted from Brisson, of whom Schaeffer appears to have been a great admirer. The following is a list of these twenty-six generic names, and of the first species mentioned under each of them, which we may look upon as the type of the genus intended by Schaeffer, unless there is some reason to the contrary:—

List of Schaeffer's new Generic Names.

No.	GENUS.	FIRST SPECIES.	PAGE
II.	Lagopus.	Lagopus urogallus	2
III.	Perdix.	Perdix perdix	4
V.	Accipiter.	Accipiter nœus	6
VI.	Aquila.	Aquila nœvia	9
VII.	Asio.	Asio bubo	10
X.	Pica.	Pica pica	13
XI.	Garrulus.	Garrulus glandarius	14
XII.	Nucifraga.	Nucifraga caryocatactes	14
*XIII.	Galgulus.	Galgulus garrula	14
XXI.	Carduelis.	Carduelis carduelis	23
XXII.	Passer.	Passer domesticus	24
XXIII.	Coccothraustes.	Coccothraustes coccothraustes	28
XXV.	Pyrrhula.	Pyrrhula rubicella	30
XXVIII.	Ficedula.	Ficedula hippolais	33
XXXII.	Mellisuga.	Mellisuga moschitus	41
*XXXIII.	Torquilla.	Torquilla iyux	42
*XXXVII.	Ispida.	Ispida ispida	47
XLII.	Limosa.	Limosa totanus	52
XLIV.	Numenius.	Numenius arquata	54
XLV.	Ciconia.	Ciconia alba	55
XLVII.	Gallinula.	Gallinula chloropus	58
L.	Uria.	Uria grylle	60
LI.	Fratercula.	Fratercula arctica	61
LIV.	Stercorarius.	Stercorarius parasiticus	62
LVI.	Merganser.	Merganser raucedula	66
LVIII.	Anser.	Anser ferus	68

* These three names must of course give way to the corresponding terms (*Coracias*, *Iynx*, and *Alcedo*) used by Linnæus for the same genera.

Now it is well known that in the Stricklandian Code of Nomenclature, which most of the older Ornithologists are content to follow, the twelfth edition (1766) of the 'Systema Naturæ' was adopted as the initial point of binomial nomenclature. But a reservation was made in favour of the genera established in Brisson's 'Ornithologie' of 1760. This reservation has been widely adopted, and many of Brisson's generic terms (*Perdix*, *Accipiter*, *Aquila*, &c.) are in constant and familiar use. There are, however, some authors who maintain that Brisson, not having been a Binomialist, ought not to be allowed to found genera in a Binomial System. Dr. Hartert is strongly of that opinion (see 'Ibis,' 1903, p. 418), and I, though I have usually followed the lead of my friend and master, Strickland, have always thought that it was a mistake to have made this special exception in favour of Brisson. I wish, therefore, to point out that we have, in Schaeffer's 'Museum Ornithologicum,' twenty-six of Brisson's familiar generic terms of 1760 confirmed in 1789. Thus it is only necessary for those who reject Brisson's claims to found genera to adopt as the authority for them "Schaeffer, 1789," instead of "Brisson, 1760." The generic term "*Carduelis*" for the Goldfinch comes under this category, and may be quoted by those who exclude Brisson's names as "Schaeffer, 1789." It would, therefore, as has been already pointed out (*cf.* 'Ibis,' 1904, p. 293), take precedence over "*Acanthis*, Bechstein, 1803." In the same way "*Pica*," "*Nucifraga*," and "*Garrulus*" should, in my opinion, be quoted as of "Schaeffer, 1789," and not as of "Vieillot, 1816," as is done in the 'Vögel der paläarktischen Fauna,' while "*Coccothraustes*" and "*Pyrrhula*" (of the same work) may be attributed to "Schaeffer, 1789," in place of "Pallas, 1811," and in a similar way "*Passer*" to Schaeffer instead of Koch. On the whole very little, if any, disturbance in our ordinary nomenclature would be caused by the adoption of Schaeffer's generic terms, and I do not see how we can logically justify our refusal to acknowledge their validity.